UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
JUL 27 19

THE SYRIAC VERSION OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL

BY

MARTIN JACOB WYNGARDEN

Lc

A THESIS

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN SEMITICS

1923

W. DRUGULIN, LEIPZIG, GERMANY

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

3781
P41W
Unclassed Thesis

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THE SYRIAC VERSION OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL

BY

MARTIN JACOB WYNGARDEN

A THESIS

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN SEMITICS

1923

W. DRUGULIN, LEIPZIG, GERMANY

DEDICATED

TO MY

BELOVED PARENTS

PREFACE

The author is happy to have this opportunity to express his gratitude to Professor James A. Montgomery, under whom he studied Hebrew, his major subject, and Aramaic Dialects, one of his minors; and under whose direction the investigation of this thesis was made. He also wishes to express his thanks to Assistant Professor Edward Chiera, under whom he studied Arabic, his other minor, Hebrew, and Assyrian (the last-named subject to be continued, under Professor A. T. Clay, on a Yale Fellowship). Furthermore, he wishes to record his obligation, for instruction in Arabic and Hebrew, to the late Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., at the time of his death regarded, by many, as the "leading spirit" of Orientalists in this country.

He desires also to acknowledge his obligations to his preceptors at the Grand Rapids and at the Princeton Seminaries, particularly to Professor R. D. Wilson, at whose advice and under whose instruction, he began specialization in Semitics; to Professor O. T. Allis, under whom he began Arabic and Syriac; and to Professor J. D. Davis and Professor G. Vos, under whom he took graduate work in the Old Testament.

Finally, his thanks are due to Dr. Charles C. Harrison, the donor of the Harrison Fellowship in Semitics, which it was his privilege to hold at the University of Pennsylvania.

Philadelphia, May 15, 1922.

CONTENTS

Preface 5
Abbreviations 9
Bibliography 11

I. The Critical Bases of the Argument 13
II. The Syriac Texts Used 15
III. The Relation of S to the Semitic Original 16
IV. The Relation of S to the Septuagint 18
V. The Relation of S to Theodotion 19
VI. The Relation of S to Origen 21
VII. The Relation of S to Lucian 23
VIII. The Relation of S to the Vulgate 24
IX. Interpretations 26
X. Unique Additions and Omissions 28
XI. Theological Coloring and Authorship 30
XII. The Relation of S to the Syriac Fathers 33
XIII. The Relation of S to the Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe 35
XIV. Sphere of Origin and Date 36
XV. The Value of S for the Textual Criticism of Daniel 37
XVI. Conclusions 39

ABBREVIATIONS

H	The Semitic Original of Daniel, referring to the Hebrew and the Aramaic portions alike.
G	The Septuagint.
Th	The Theodotionic Version.
Lu	The Lucianic Recension.
Or	The Origenistic Recension.
L	The Old Latin Versions.
V	The Vulgate.
V^{Am}	The Vulgate, Codex Amiatinus (the text of these two as presented in Tischendorf's edition of the Vulgate).
S	The Peshitta Text of Daniel.
S^{W}	The Peshitta Text in the London Polyglot.
S^{L}	The Lee Edition of the Peshitta.
S^{U}	The Urmia Edition of the Peshitta.
S^{A}	The Ambrosian Codex of the Peshitta, edited by Ceriani.

For convenience' sake, Hebrew letters, instead of Syriac characters, have been used. The Rebbuy has, however, been retained.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barnes, W. E.,	The Peshitta Psalter.	Cambridge 1904
Barnes, W. E.,	An Apparatus Criticus to Chronicles in The Peshitta Version.	Cambridge 1897
Bloch, J.,	The Authorship of the Peshitta.	A. J. S. L. 1919
Bloch, J.,	The Influence of the Greek Bible on the Peshitta.	A. J. S. L. 1920
Bloch, J.,	The Printed Texts of the Peshitta Old Testament.	A. J. S. L. 1921
Bloch, J.,	A Critical Examination of the Text of the Syriac Version of the Song of Songs.	A. J. S. L. 1922
Burkitt, F. C.,	Early Eastern Christianity.	London 1904
Burkitt, F. C.,	Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe.	Cambridge 1904
Duval, R.,	La Littérature Syriaque.	Paris 1900
Ephraem Syrus,	Opera Omnia. Tomus Secundus.	Rome 1740
Field, F.,	Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt.	Oxford 1875
Graffin, A. R.,	Aphraates Demonstrationes, Patrologia Syriaca, vol. I.	Paris 1894
Mai, A.,	Patrum Nova Bibliotheca, vol. VII.	Romae 1854
(Michaelis, J. D.)	Danielis Versio Theodotionaea—Ex Chisiano Codice.	Goettingae 1774
Nestle, E.,	Novum Testamentum Graece.	Stuttgart 1906
Swete, H. B.,	The Old Testament in Greek, vol. III.	Cambridge 1899
Tischendorf, C. de,	Biblia Sacra Latina.	Lipsiae 1873
Wright, W.,	A Short History of Syriac Literature.	London 1894

Articles on the Syriac Versions in Encyclopaedias and Bible Dictionaries.

I. THE CRITICAL BASES OF THE ARGUMENT

My purpose is to investigate the Syriac (Peshitta) Version of Daniel in its relation to the Semitic original and the great translations, with a view toward ascertaining what may be known of its source, its authorship, its theological provenance, its age and its value for textual critical purposes. As to the authorship of the Peshitta Old Testament, in general, Theodore of Mopsuestia says, ἡρμήνευται δὲ ταῦτα εἰς μὲν τὴν Σύρων παρ' ὅτου δή ποτε οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔγνωσται μέχρι τῆς τήμερον ὅστις ποτὲ οὗτος ἐστίν.[1]

We shall, accordingly, never know the identity of the translator; but if we can place the Syriac of Daniel in its relation to the Hebrew, and particularly to the Greek versions and recensions, we can fix its comparative age. It will, therefore, be of use to investigate the character of the Syriac of Daniel, to discover what the text was which the translator had before him, and the influence, if any, of other translations upon the Syriac.

Furthermore, this will involve the study of its divergencies from its original through unique additions and omissions, interpretations and theological coloring; the question whether these divergencies come from a Christian or a Jewish provenance; and finally, the value of the Syriac version for the textual criticism of the Semitic original of Daniel, as we now have it. For instance, the degree of its dependence on the Greek, will affect its value as an independent witness to the text of the Semitic original.

This work, which has been pursued under the guidance of my preceptor, Prof. James A. Montgomery, bases itself, in part, on certain results to which he has come in his study of the

---

[1] To Zephaniah 1 6, Mai, Patrum Nova Bibliotheca, vol. VII, 252.

Greek texts, and which he has most generously permitted me to use. These results, which are to be published, are in the main as follows:

1. The Theodotionic text is best represented by B. This codex gives us, with the exception of scribal errors and some interpolations from the Septuagint, a very perfect form of the text. It is pre-Hexaplaric and receives support and frequent rectification from the Old Latin texts, notably the Weingarten and Würzburg Fragments, published by Ranke; as well as from Patristic citations. Accordingly, B is taken as the type of Theodotion, except in so far as it may be corrected from related Greek MSS., and especially the Old Latin.

2. The Hexaplaric revision of Theodotion is represented by Codex A, 25, 106, and other cursives. Hence, for Origenistic readings, it has, in general, been convenient to use the references to A in Swete's "The Old Testament in Greek." And so, unless otherwise indicated, I mean by Origen the text of A.

3. The Lucianic revision is represented by the Greek cursives 22, 36, 51, 231, and, in large part, by the Chigi Theodotion text.

These results have an important bearing on the origin of the Syriac version. If the Syriac version shows dependence upon Lucian, it must be later than Lucian. If not dependent upon Lucian, but upon Origen, it would naturally be later than Origen, but probably earlier than Lucian, since his recension became very prominent among the Syrians. If it is not dependent upon Origen, but upon Theodotion, it would, similarly, be later than Thedotion, but probably earlier than Origen, because his revision, also, received wide acceptance among the Syrians. If it shows no trace of Theodotion but of the Septuagint, it would be still earlier than the text of Theodotion, since this translation completely supplanted the Septuagint in the church. Accordingly, if it can be proved that one or more of these Greek versions, or recensions, markedly colored the Syriac translation and that others did not, we may thereby be able to determine its age and origin, and its value for the textual criticism of the Book of Daniel, in its present form.

No attempt has, heretofore, been made to align the Peshitta text of Daniel, in the manner attempted in this discussion, with the great translations and revisions, especially the Septuagint,

Theodotion, Origen, and Lucian. The necessity of such investigation as the present has been felt by several scholars. Of Lucian, Wright says, "Such an opportunity (for harmonizing the Peshitta with the Septuagint) may have been afforded on a considerable scale by the adoption of Lucian's text of the Septuagint, at Antioch in the beginning of the fourth century."[1] Duval urges an investigation of this kind in still more definite terms: "A cette époque la recension de Lucien d'Antioche était répandue en Syrie, et il y aurait intérêt à rechercher si la revision de la Peshitta est demeurée étrangère à cette recension."[2] It is proved, however, in Section VII, that the Syriac is not dependent upon Lucian.

We shall, accordingly, compare the Syriac text of Daniel with the Semitic original and with the translations and recensions indicated; study its general character; and sum up our conclusions as to its source, authorship, place, time, and value at the end.

II. THE SYRIAC TEXTS USED

The Syriac texts, used for this dissertation, are that of the London Polyglot; that of the Urmia Edition; that of the Lee Edition; and that of the photographic copy of the Ambrosian Codex, published by Ceriani.

The Peshitta version in the London Polyglot was taken from the Paris Polyglot. In Daniel, it intersperses a few historical explanations of the visions into the body of the text.

These are not repeated in the Lee Edition, which was reprinted from it. S^L has אמרת in 2 5, whereas $S^W S^U S^A$ have דאמרת.

The Urmia Edition, though also a reprint from the London Polyglot, corrects it in one instance. In 1 11 S^W and S^L have משיצר. S^U has מניצר, which is supported by S^A, and is correct. For all the texts have מניצר in 1 16.

---

[1] Syriac Literature, p. 4.

[2] La Littérature Syriaque, p. 40.

The Ambrosian Codex also presents another correction. The Hebrew word מקצת, in 1 2 is omitted by S^{WSLSU}. But S^{A}, in a conflate reading, has this partitive idea: ולמאנא דביתה דמריא ומן מאנא דביתה דמריא.

S^{A} also corrects S^{WSUSL} in 2 28. H בשמיא, S^{WSLSU} דשמיא, S^{A} בשמיא. In 7 25, S^{A} lacks the plus, ועדנא, found in S^{WSLSU}. This plus is also found in Aphraates, as is shown in Section XII. It therefore seems that S^{A} has been corrected to the Hebrew, or was originally a better text. However, it lacks 7 15-19.

Between all the texts other variations, somewhat similar to those shown above, occur; but they are not of such a character as to affect the conclusions of this investigation.

III. THE RELATION OF S TO THE SEMITIC ORIGINAL

The Peshitta of Daniel, though colored, as we shall see in Section V, by Theodotion, was translated from the Semitic original. This appears from some readings which are common to the Semitic original and the Syriac, as against the Greeks:

1 16 המלצר, S מניצר.
2 5,8 אזדא, S שריראהי. 2 5 הדמין תתעבדון, S הדם הדם תתפסקון.
2 9 די (primo) S ד. 2 9 חדה־היא דתכון, S חדאהי דתכון.
2 12 בגם, S אתחמת.
2 13 חכימיא מתקטלין, S חכימא מתקטלון.
2 14 רב־טבחיא, S רב־דחשא.
2 24 אזל, S ואזל.
2 27 יכלין, S משכחין.
2 31 זיוה, S זיוה.
3 1 דורא, S דורא.
5 15 חכימיא אשפיא, S חרשא ואשופא.
5 25 H = S מנא מנא תקל ופרסין.
7 17 מלכין, S מלכין.
8 9 קרן־אחת מצעירה, S קרנא חדא זעורתא.
8 10 תפל, S אפלת.

8 12 צבא, S חילא.
8 18 על־עמדי, S על קימי.
8 22 גוי, S עמא.
8 25 בשלה, S בשליא (possibly); שר־שרים, S שליט שליטנא.
8 25 ישבר, S נתתשר.
9 26 משיח, S משיחא.
9 27 כנף, S כנפיה.
11 2 יעיר, S נעיר.
11 10 (bis) יתגרו, S נתגרון.
11 15 לא, S לא.
11 18 השבית קצין, S ונבטל שליטא.

That the Peshitta text of Daniel is a primary version from the Semitic original appears, furthermore, from errors of the Syriac translator due to mistakes in reading the original. Examples follow:

Errors of Sound:

1. Interchange of labials:

7 11 בחין, S וחיא, *i. e.* ב to ו.
11 8 בשבי, S ושביתא, *i. e.* ב to ו.

2. Pointing differently than the accepted reading:

9 1 המלך, S אמלך, *i. e.* המליך.
9 24 משח, S משיחא, *i. e.* משיח.
9 26 נהרצת, S פסנותא, *i. e.* נֶחֱרָצַת.
11 8, 13 שנים, S חד תרין, *i. e.* שְׁנַיִם.
11 38 חמדות, S רגתא, *i. e.* חֶמְדַּת.

Errors of Sight:

1. Mistaking one letter for another:

7 21 יכלה להן, S ומציא חילהין, *i. e.* יכל חלהן.
7 24 ישנא, S נתיתר, *i. e.* ישנא.
7 25 יבלא, S נכלא, *i. e.* *יכלא.
11 2 בעשרו, S באתרא, *i. e.* עשר as *אשר, "place."

2. Additions of a letter or of letters:

11 4 לאחרים, S לית אחרין, *i. e.* לא אחרין.
11 45 עד, S עדן.
12 7 נפץ, S נתפצין, *i. e.* *נפצא as niphal.

3. Omission of a letter or of letters:

11 35 ללבן, S למתינו, *i. e.* לבן.
11 45 אפדנו, S באתרא שפיא, *i. e.* *פדן, "field."

4. Transposition of letters:

8 2, 3, 6 אובל, S אבול.

8 25 במאחז אידא, S באפס יד, *i. e.* באסף.

11 24 יבזור, S נדבר, *i. e.* *יזבר.

11 41 ראשית, S שרכא, *i. e.* שארית.

5. Omission of words by homoeoteleuton:

7 11 חזה הוית באדין מן־קל מליא.

רברבתא די קרנא ממללה.

For the words חזה הוית also follow ממללה.

6. Repitition of words from H:

8 7 מידו, S מן איהוהי דצפרא דעזא.

For H 8 8 begins with וצפיר העזים.

IV. THE RELATION OF S TO THE SEPTUAGINT

Though there are some correspondences between S and G, the differences are much greater. Hence there is little or no dependence of S upon G. The following exhibits the character of the relationship:

3 3 מדינתא, S + ואתו, + του ελθειν, but G lacks S + חדתא; and S and G may be independently repeating למתא from 3 2, whereas S is inclined to add.

4 12 חיותא, S 15 חיות ברא, 12 (15) των θηριων της γης, but in chapters 4–6, G offers a paraphrastic text not represented in S.

5 23 לא הדרת, S לא שבחת ולא יקרת, και ουκ ευλογησας αυτον ουδε ηνεσας αυτω, but this verse also presents many variations between G and S.

6 7 הרגשו, S 6 קרבו, 6 (7) προσηλθοσαν, but this may be independent softening down of הרגשו, since in 6 4 (5) G has οι δυο νεανισκοι as plotting against Daniel, whereas S = H in this respect.

6 25 בניהון ונשיהון, S ולנשיהון ולבניהון, και αι γυναικες αυτων και τα τεκνα αυτων; but S adds אנון בנוהא, as against G, and G abbreviates considerably in this verse.

8 25 בלבבו יגדיל, S ולבה נתתרים, και η καρδια αυτου υψωθησεται, but the sense of H and S is identical.

8 25 באפם יד, S במאחז אידא, ποιησει συναγωγης χειρος; but it is more probable that S is from באסף than from G; for G, in this verse, adds τους αγιους as against HS, renders בשלוה by δολω, whereas S has בשליא, and renders שר־שרים by απωλειας ανδρων, whereas S has שליט שליטנא.

11 1 עמדי למחזיק ולמעוז לו, S קם למחילותני ולמעשנותני ειπεν μοι ενισχυσαι και ανδριζεσθαι, but G read עמדי as אמר whereas S read it correctly.

11 13 העתים, S זבנא, καιρου, but S does not have the addition of G, πολεως.

11 40 ושטף ועבר, SG omit, but G adds Αιγυπτου, as against S.

V. THE RELATION OF S TO THEODOTION

The correspondences between S and Th, as against H, are far more numerous than those between S and any of the other Greek versions or recensions. From their number, and from the character of some of them, the conclusion is fully warranted that Th colored S:

2 9 ישתנא, παρελθη, נעבר.
2 16 ו על, Th S om.
2 22 עמה שרא, μετ' αυτου εστιν, עמההו.
2 34 הדקת המון, ελεπτυνεν (B^{ab} + αυτους) εις τελος, ודקקת אנון טב.
2 35 המון רוחא, πληθος του πνευματος, אנון רוחא קיפתא.
3 14 הצדא, ει αληθως, בקושתא.
3 17 הן, γαρ, מתל ד.
3 22 כל־קבל דנה, Th S om.
3 29 יאמר שלה, ειπη βλασφημιαν, נגדף.
4 5 אחרין, Th S om.
4 6 אמר, ειπον μοι, אמר לי.
4 9 תטלל, κατεσκηνουν, עמרן.
4 10 וחזוי ראשי, Th S om.
4 14 עירין, ειρ, עירא.
4 15 ואנתה (2°), + Δανιηλ, + דניאל.
4 19 לסוף, εις τα περατα, לכל סופיה.

5 3 הנפקו, εξηνεγκεν, אפק.
5 3 בית, Th S om.
5 11 אבוך מלכא, Th S om.
5 17 נבזביתך, την δωρεαν της οικιας σου, איקר ביתך.
5 21 כתורין, ως βουν, איך תורא.
5 22 כל־דנה, παντα ταυτα, הלין כלהין.
5 23 כספא ודהב, χρυσους και αργυρους, דהבא ודסאמא.
6 4 דנה, Th S om.
6 7 אלן, Th S om.
6 7 עלמין, τον αιωνα, עלמא.
6 10 כל־קבל דנה, τοτε, הידין.
6 12 הרגשו, παρετηρησαν, נטרו.
6 19 דהון, εδεσματα, מאכולתא.
6 27 די (3°), Th S om.
6 29 דנה, Th S om.
7 5 אחרי, Th S om.
7 6 אחרי, ετερον θηριον, חיותא אחרתא.
7 16 ואמר לי, + την ακριβειαν, + בשרא.
7 20 ועינין, Th S om ו.
8 9 ואל הצבי, Th S om.
8 12 תנתן, εδοθη, אתיהב.
8 12 תשלך, εριφη, אשתרי *i. e.* תֻּשְׁלַךְ.
8 14 אלי, αυτω, לה.
8 22 מלכיות, βασιλεις, מלכין.
8 22 בכחו, εν τη ισχυι αυτων, בחילהון.
8 23 הפשעים, αμαρτιων, חובא.
8 24 עצם, κραταια, תקיף *i. e.* עֲצוּם.
9 23 להגיד, του αναγγελαι, למחויותך.
9 26 עם, συν, עם.
9 27 שקוצים, βδελυγμα, מנפותא.
10 7 יברחו בהחבא, εφυγον εν φοβω, ערקו מן דחלתא.
10 16 צירי, τα εντος μου, גוי.
11 2 הכל את מלכות יון, πασαις βασιλειαις Ελληνων, כל מלכותהון דיוניא.
11 5 ממשלתן, Th S om.
11 15 ועם מבחריו, και αναστησονται και οι εκλεκτοι αυτου, ונקומון גביא דעמא.
11 17 ישרים, ευθεια παντα, כל.
11 17 ועשה, ποιησει, נעבד.
11 19 למעוזי, εις την ισχυν, על תוקפה.

11 24 מחשבתיו, λογισμους, מחשבן.
11 34 בחלקלקות, εν ολισθρημασιν, בפלגותא.
11 45 אהלי, την σκηνην αυτου, משכנה.
12 13 לגרלך, εις τον κληρον σου, לזבנך.

S must have followed εις τον καιρον σου, which occurs in a few Theodotionic MSS., viz., — 25, 35, 48, 89, 229, 230.

VI. THE RELATION OF S TO ORIGEN

There is no good evidence that S is dependent upon Or. The following aims to give the more important instances from which dependence of S upon Or may be argued. In each case G has much the same reading as Or. Moreover, the instances are of such a character that the correspondences prove little:

3 7 פסנטרין, S sustitutes וצפוניא, και ψαλτηριου και συμφωνιας.
4 27 מלכא, S A om.
4 30 נבוכדנצר, S 33 נבוכדנצר מלכא.
(33) 30 Ναβουχοδονοσορ τον βασιλεα.
5 8 כל חכימי, S A om כל.
8 19 ויאמר, S ואמר לי, και ειπεν μοι.

There are also a few readings in which S agrees with A and Q as against H. Yet these, too, are not important enough to argue for a dependence of S upon A or Q. The following list aims to give all the instances from which any dependence of S upon AQ could be argued.

1 20 בכל מלכותו, S במלכותה, εν τη βασιλεια αυτου.
2 34 והדקת המון, S ודקקת אנון טב, και ελεπτυνεν αυτους εις τελος.
2 35 ונשא המון רוחא, S ונסבת אנון רבחא תקיפתא, και εξηρεν αυτα το πληθος του πνευματος.
3 25 ענה ואמר, S ענא מלכא ואמר, (B^{ab})AQ και ειπεν ο βασιλευς.
11 7 כנו, S על אתרא, A επι της ετοιμασιας.
Q* επι την ετοιμασιαν.
Q^{a} επι της ετοιμασιας.

11 15 ועם מבחריו, S ונקומון גבּיא דעמא, AQ και αναστησονται οι εκλεκτοι αυτου.

Though the last instance is rather striking, it is not sufficient to prove dependence of S upon A or Q, since AQ differ from Th here only by a και. And it has been proved, in Section V, that S is dependent upon Th.

The following correspondences are common to Or and Lu, but are not sufficient to prove dependence of S upon either Or or Lu, because they are all of a minor character:

2 48 על (2°), S ועל, A Q* Lu και επι.
3 12 לאלהיך, S ולאלהך, A Lu και τοις θεοις σου.
4 8 לסוף, S 11 סופּיה, A Q Lu εις τα περατα.
4 23 אמרו, S 26 אמר, A Q Lu ειπεν.
4 28 מלכותא, S 31 מלכותך, A Q Lu η βασιλεια σου.
4 31 עלמא, S 34 עלמּא, A Q Lu αιωνας.
9 3 תחנונים, S בתבשפתא, A Q Lu δεησιν.
9 19 אל, S ועל, A Q Lu και μη.
12 6 יאמר, S אמרו, A Q Lu ειπον.

Q belongs to the Origenistic group; this MS presents, as has often been noticed, unique readings; we are therefore not surprised in finding such readings also in Daniel. S exhibits cases of agreement with Q, which are of interest, but they are not important enough to allow any conclusions of dependence:

2 2 חלמתיו, S חלמה, το ενυπνιον αυτου.
2 4 פשרא, S פשרה, την συγχρισιν αυτου.
2 12 אתחמת רורבאית וברוגוא שגיאא ואמר, S בנם וקצף שגיא ואמר, (B^{ab}) Q εν θυμω και οργη πολλη ειπεν.
2 31 צלמא דכן רב, S om צלמא דכן רב, Q om עלמא דכן, S omits רב and introduces דטב.
4 9 חיות ברא, S 12 כלהין חיותא דברא, (12) 9 παντα τα θηρια τα αγρια.
4 12 חיותא, S 15 חיות ברא, (15) 12 των θηριων αγριων.
7 13 עם, S על, επι.
9 17 אלהינו, S אלהא, κυριε ο θεος.
9 27 מנחה, S קורּבנה, θυσιας.

VII. THE RELATION OF S TO LUCIAN

No dependence of S upon Lu exists, because all the characteristic doublets of the Lucianic MSS., 22, 36, 51, 231 are lacking in S, and because even the correspondences prove no dependence. The more important correspondences between S and Lu are the following:

2 24 כל־קבל דנה, S ובה בשעתא, και ευθεως.

But cf. 3 8 כל־קבל דנה, S ובה בשעתא, Lu τοτε.

3 11 ויסגד, S + בה בשעתא.

3 21 באדין, V et confestim.

3 26 באדין (2°), V statimque.

3 22 הסקו, S אכלו קרציהון, διαβαλλοντας.

Cf. 6 25 where the accusers of Daniel are punished. Here S and Lu present an interesting Syrian interpretation of הסקו, which does not mean G ενεβαλοσαν, A βαλλοντας, but "lift up." This interpretation of S is undoubtedly due to the similarity between the Syriac word, עַשֶּׁק, "accusavit," and הסקו. It may have been followed by Lu, or Lu may have chosen the same interpretation independently.

4 14 מאמר קדישין, S 17 מאמר קדישא, ρημα αγιον.

4 27 ענה, S 30 וענה, και απεκριθη.

6 22 מלל, S מלל ואמר, ελαλησε .... και ειπεν.

8 22 והנשברת, S ודאתתברת, και οτι συνετριβη.

11 27 נתנו, S נתיהב, εδοθη.

The more important correspondences between A Q S and Lu have been cited in the discussion of the relationship between S and Or, in Section VI. Other correspondences between S and Lu, which are not, however, unique in character are the following:

2 4 פשרא, S פשרה, G Q Lu συγκρισιν αυτου.

3 3 לחנכת צלמא, S ואתו לעארא דצלמא, G Lu του ελθειν εις τον εγκαινισμον της εικονος.

3 22 גבריא, S ולגברא, G Lu και τους ανδρας.

8 1 המלך, S G Lu om.

12 9 ויאמר, S ואמר לי, G Lu και ειπεν μοι.

From the above it is clear that no dependence of S upon Lu can be established.

VIII. THE RELATION OF S TO THE VULGATE

There are various instances in which both S and V agree with Th, as against H. In the instances listed below, both are dependent on Th. Therefore, the additional evidence which S and V appear to give to a reading of Th as against H, does not really have any great importance. Take, for instance, the very accessible list of variants to Daniel, given by Max Löhr in the Biblia Hebraica, edited by Kittel. There you will find in many instances (compare below) Th, S, and V as against H. Since, however, S and V are here shown to be dependent upon Th, therefore, a reading depending upon Th, S, and V, as against H, reduces itself to Th as against H. Instances in which S and V are dependent upon Th follow:

2 9 ישתנא, παρελθη, נעבר, pertranseat.
2 22 עמה שרא, μετ αυτου εστιν, עמההו, cum eo est.
3 22 כל־קבל דנה, Th S V om.
3 29 יאמר שלה, ειπη βλασφημιαν, נגדף, 96 locuta fuerit blasphemiam.
4 9 תטלל, κατεσκηνουν, עמרן, habitabant.
5 3 הנפקו, εξηνεγκεν, אפק, asportaverat.
5 21 כתורין, ως βουν, איך תורא, ut bos.
5 22 כל־דנה, παντα ταυτα, הלין כלהין, haec omnia.
6 4 דנה, 3 Th S V om.
6 7 אלן, 6 Th S V om.
6 7 עלמין, 6 τον αιωνα, עמלא, aeternum.
6 10 כל־קבל דנה, 9 τοτε, הידין, porro.
6 12 הרגשו, παρετηρησαν, נטרו, curiosius inquirentes.
Löhr Th "παρετηρησαν, V curiosius inquirentes."
6 19 דהון, εδεσματα, מאכולתא, 18 cibi.
6 27 די (3°), Th S V om.
7 20 וטינין, Th S V om ו. Löhr "וְ dl c G Th S V."
8 12 תנתן, εδοθη, אתיהב, datum est.
8 12 תשלך, εριφη, אשתרי, prosternetur, *i. e.* תִּשָּׁלַךְ.
Löhr "l c G Th S V וַתָּשְׁלַךְ."
8 23 הפשעים, αμαρτιων, חובא, iniquitates, *i. e.* הַפְּשָׁעִים.

9 20 חטאתי, τας αμαρτιας μου, חוֹבי, peccata mea.
Löhr "1 MS G Th V S A חטאתָי."
9 23 להגיד, του αναγγελαι σοι, למחויותך, ut indicarem tibi.
Löhr "2 MSS G Th V S A + לְךָ."
9 26 עם συν עַם cum.
Löhr "1 MS G Th S V A עִם."
9 27 שקוצים, βδελυγμα, טנפותא, abominatio.
11 17 ועשה, ποιησει, נעבד, faciet.
Löhr "1 c G Th S V A יֵעָשֶׂה."
11 19 למעוזי, εις την ισχυν, על תוקפה, ad imperium.
11 34 בחלקלקות, εν ολισθρημασιν, בפלגותא, fraudulenter.
11 45 אהלי, την σκηνην αυτου, משכנה, tabernaculum suum.
Löhr "1 MS G Th S V A אהלו".

The correspondence between S and V, as against H and Th, include a number of interpretations, which are common to S and V. Although leaving the discussion of these interpretations to Section IX, on "Interpretations", I include them among the correspondences between S and V:

3 3 נבכדנצר, S נבכדנצר מלכא, Nabuchodonosor rex (V^{Am} Nabuchodonosor).
6 16 למלכא, S לה, ei.
6 22 מלל, S מלל ואמר, respondens ait.
7 14 יָחַב, S יְהַב, dedit.
7 23 כן, S והכנא, et sic.
8 2 יאראה (1°), S V om ו.
8 2 ויהי בראתי, S V om.
8 2 וחזית . . . . דקאם אנא . . . . . ואראה . . . . . ואני הייתי, vidi . . me esse.
8 11 הרים, S ארים, tulit: tradition of Kethibh: הֵרִים; Qere: חֵרַם.
8 11 השלך, S שרא, deiecit, *i. e.* השליך.
8 12 צבא = S דחילא = robur (Greeks omit).
8 12 רשע, S חובא, peccata.
8 19 ויאמר הנני, S ואמר לי הא אנא, dixitque mihi ego.
9 26 יכרת, S נתקטל, occidetur.
9 27 תתך, S תתניח, perseverabit (V^{Am} perseveravit).
10 7 המראה (2°), S V om.
10 21 על־אלה, S בהלין כלהין, in omnibus his.

11 6 והילדה ומחזקה S, ועלימתה ומתקפניה, adolescentes eius et qui comfortabant eam.

11 31 ונתנו השקוץ משמם S, ונתלין טנפותא לחבלא, et dabunt abominationem in desolationem.

12 1 ובעת, S V om ו.

12 6 אשר ממעל S, וקאם לעל, qui stabat super.

12 11 שקוץ שמם S, טנפותא לחבלא, abominatio in desolationem, (V^{Am} abominatio in desolatione).

IX. INTERPRETATIONS

There are a number of interpretations in S, some of which it has in common with V. Interpretative tendencies have also been noted:

1 8 יתגאל (1°), S נאכול (2°), נוכליוהי.

1 10 וחיבתם את ראשי למלך S, וגפסוק רישי מלכא.

2 29 על־משכבך S, על לבך. But cf. Section XII.

3 24 בהתבהלה S, בדחלתא רבתא, cf. Hebrew בהלה.

7 15 בגו נדנה or בגין דנה S, בגו משכבי.

Evidently, it appears that S has somewhat ingeniously guessed at the meaning of בגונדנה, and interpreted it as בגוניא. Cf. S גוניא, "bed."

8 11 מכון S, מתקן.

8 12 אמת S, קודשא.

9 25 חרוץ S, פלטותה.

Cf. חרץ, "moat," Zakir[1] Inscription, L 10. No textual emendation is, therefore, necessary; as against Löhr, who writes: "l וָחוּץ."

10 4 הוא הדקל S, פרת.

11 6 ולא תעצר כוח הזרוע S, ולא נהוא בה חיל.

11 6 ולא יעמד וזרעו S, מן דחלתא דתדחל.

11 22 וזרעות השטף S, ותוקפהין דכדכא.

11 30 ציים S, משריתא.

11 32 בחלקות S, נחיב אנון.

---

[1] Inscriptions Sémitiques par H. Pognon, Planche XXXV.

11 41 הצבי, S דאיסראיל.
12 1 השר, S מלאכא.
12 4 ישטטו, S ונבעון.

Certain interpretations are common to S and V. Jerome frequently consulted the Jews as to the meaning of the Hebrew Old Testament. The Syriast appears to have done the same.[1] The following Jewish interpretations may be noted:

8 2 וחזית . . . . . , V vidi . . . me esse. S ואראה . . . . . ואני הייתי, S דקאם אנא
S and V represent the interpretation that Daniel's presence in Shushan was a part of the vision.

8 11 הרים, S ארים, V tulit = Kethibh: הֵרִים; Qere הֵרַם.
8 11 השלך, S שרא, V deiecit, *i. e.* השליך.
8 12 צבא = S חילא = V robur (Greeks omit).
8 12 רשע, S חובא, V peccata.
11 6 והילדה ומחזקה, S דעלימתה ומתקפניה, V adolescentes eius et qui comfortabant eam.
11 31 ונתנו השקוץ משמם, S ונתלון מנפותא לחבלא, V et dabunt abominationem in desolationem.
12 11 שקוץ שמם, S מנפותא לחבלא, V abominatio in desolationem.

The following interpretative tendencies deserve special notice: S elucidates "stand," in connections where it means "serve," by rendering it "serve," or by adding "serve", whereas otherwise it would possibly have had a different connotation to the readers:

7 16 קאמיא, S משמשנא.
1 4 לעמד, S למשמשותה . . . למקם.
10 12 לתענות, S למקם.

To magicians the meed of "wise men" is sometimes refused; Daniel, on the other hand, is no longer styled "master of the magicians," but "master of the wise men."

---

[1] Wright, Syr. Lit., p. 3: "That Jews should have had at any rate a consultative share in thi works need not surprise us, when we remember that Syrian fathers, such as Aphraates, in the middle of the 4th century, and Jacob of Edessa, in the latter half of the 7th, had frequent recourse, like Jerome, to the scholars of the synagogue."

5 15 חכימיא, S חרשא.
4 6 רב חרטמיא, S רב חכימא.

S interprets the instances where Daniel is said to have been in a deep sleep, by the rendering that he prostrated himself, or fell down:

8 18 נרדמתי; S אתנרגחת.
10 9 אני הייתי נרדם, S נפלת.

X. UNIQUE ADDITIONS AND OMISSIONS

The Peshitta has differences of text from the Semitic original. One group of these different readings constitutes the additions which are unique to the Peshitta. The following may be noted:

1 4 למשמשותה.
1 16 למאכל ומיא למשתא.
2 4 דאמרין.
2 10 מן מתום.
2 12 רורבאית.
2 42 דחזית.
3 2 חדתא.
3 3 חדתא.
3 10 דאקימת.
3 11 בה בשעתא.
3 26 אתונא.
3 27 עממא כלהון ו.
4 1 כתב.
4 9 בסר.
4 20 וקרא בחיל.
4 20 בעסבא דארעא ולבה מן בנינשא נשנא ולבא דחיותא נתיהב לה.
4 29 ומן טאלא דשמיא תצטבע.
4 29 ולשפל אנשין נקים עליה.
5 7 ולחכימא.
5 11 סגיאתא.
5 21 עדמא דסערה רבא איך דנשרא וטפרוהי איך דעופא.
5 21 ולשפל אנשין נקים עליה.
6 5 באלהה.

6 10 ופקד.
6 13 לעלם חיי.
6 18 רבתא.
6 25 וארמיו אנון בגובא.
6 28 ופרק.
7 1 למלכותה.
7 19 חיותא.
7 20 מן בינתהין.
9 2 חזית.
9 16 דעבדת עמן.
9 16 עמך אתבדר בכל אתר.
9 21 וטם נאתא מן שמיא.
9 25 לאורשלם.
10 11 קום.
11 2 יתיר.
11 15 מתל דלית בהון חילא למקם.
11 15 לא נשכחון.
12 3 ועבדי טבתא.
12 3 נהוון מזהרין וקימין.
12 4 ושתוק.

Another group of readings of the Peshitta, which are different from the Semitic original are the omissions unique to the Syriac. Examples follow:

2 15 ענה ואמד לאריוך טליטא די־מלכא.
2 37 ותקפא.
2 48 רברבן.
4 2 והרהרין על משכבי.
4 7 ואלו.
4 30 גשמה.
5 12 יתירא.
5 16 כען.
6 14 מלכא טעם.
6 28 יד.
7 5 וארו.
7 8 ואלו (bis).
7 11 חזה הוית באדין מן־קל מליא רברבתא די קרנא ממללה.
7 13 בחזוי ליליא וארו.
9 16 ועמך.
9 20 מדבר.

11 8 עם נסכיהם.
11 28, 29 ושב לארצו למועד ישוב ובא בנגב ולא־תהיה.
11 30 ועשה ושב.
11 36 ויתגדל.
11 39 ירבה כבוד.
12 2 אדמת.

XI. THEOLOGICAL COLORING AND AUTHORSHIP

It is mooted question whether the Syriac version of the Old Testament comes from a Jewish, or a Christian, provenance. From two of the following instances, especially (see 9 24, and 9 26), I draw the conclusion that the Peshitta of Daniel hails from a Christian provenance:

6 28 משיזב ומצל, S + פרק.

Although פרק has the general meaning of "redeem," it is also used more specifically in contexts that refer to Christ, *e. g.*, Titus 2 14 דנפרקן and I Peter 1 18 אתפרקתון. This addition may, therefore, have come from either a Jewish or a Christian hand.

9 24 ולמשח קדש קדשים, and to anoint the holy of holies; S ולמשיחא קדוש קודשין, and the Messiah, (who is) the holy of holies. The attribution of holiness to Christ, in the early church, was an expression of divinity, as in the expression, "Holy Child".

9 25 משיח נגיד, S משיחא מלכא.

When נגיד does not refer to משיח, S does not render it by מלכא. Cf. 11 22 נגיד, S מדבּרנא. To call the Messiah "king," would fit in both a Jewish and a Christian community. A somewhat analogous change is found in I Chron. 5 2. Speaking of Judah, H reads: ולנגיד ממנו, but S reads: מן יהודא נפוק מלכא משיחא. This change in the Syriac of Chronicles, with respect to the tense of נפוק,[1] may come from either a Jewish or a Christian provenance, but the latter is the more probable.

[1] However, Codex F has נפק. Cf. p. 4 of Barnes's Apparatus Criticus to Chronicles in the Peshitta Version.

9 26 יכרת משיח, the Messiah shall be cut off; S נתקטל משיחא, the Messiah shall be killed. Here S does not follow Th, who has ἐξολοθρευθησεται χρισμα, the anointing shall be annihilated, which gives a much stronger term for יכרת. S gives a interpretation which is identical with that of Jerome, occidetur Christus. Certainly, this rendering of S did not come from a Jewish hand. This bit of theological coloring, together with that of 9 24, constitute two important instances to show that the Peshitta version of the Old Testament hails from a Christian provenance. A third instance of importance may be found in Isaiah 7 14, where עלמה is rendered בתולתא, "virgin," whereas the Syriac equivalent of עלמה would be עלימתא.

9 26 נגיד הבא, a prince that should come; S מלכא דאתא, a king that should come. Cf. Ephraim Syrus' Commentary on Daniel, in loco:

מלכא משיחא דאתא ומזדקף.

This shows that, although the expression, מלכא משיחא, would fit in a Jewish provenance, it is also used by a Syrian Christian writer.

The passage quoted from Isaiah, and many others, have certainly impressed their weight upon such authorities as Bloch[1] and Burkitt,[2] who had to weaken their arguments greatly, by assuming a later Christian coloring. They do not discuss the Peshitta text of Daniel. Now the earliest quotations from the Peshitta text of Daniel, namely those of Aphraates and Ephraim Syrus (see Section XII) retain the same Christian coloring of 9 24 and 9 26, as we find in the Peshitta text of Daniel in its present form. In fact, Aphraates[3] also quotes Isaiah 7 14, with the reading בתולתא, "virgin." This evidence is against the

---

1 A. J. S. L., vol. 35, p. 219, "Indeed all of these and other similar quotations would furnish quite reliable proof of Christian authorship, provided we could be certain that they were part of the original version, and not due to subsequent modifications."

2 Early Eastern Christianity, p. 71, "I do not forget that the influence of the Greek Bible, especially in Isaiah often makes itself felt; that element I shall notice later." P. 73, "But if we regard the Peshitta as a Jewish work, we must at the same time confess that we cannot claim to have the translation quite in its original form."

3 Graffin's text, p. 806.

assumption that the Christian coloring is due to a later hand. The earliest existing quotations from the Peshitta, namely those of the Syriac Fathers, have this Christian coloring. Cf. XII.

Concerning the authorship of the Peshitta text, as a whole, Bloch says, "The translators has a very good knowledge of the Hebrew text, and an excellent acquaintance with Jewish traditions to so large an extent that it is quite impossible to avoid considering the Peshitta as the work of Jews."

But Jerome also had frequent recourse[1] to the scholars of the synagogue, and reflects Jewish traditions in the Vulgate. Indeed, like Jerome, the translators of the Peshitta may have had Jewish assistance, without being Jews.

The statement that the translators had a very good knowledge of the Hebrew text, will no doubt apply to other books of the Peshitta Old Testament, but this can hardly be said for the translators of Daniel. They seem to rely upon their native Syriac vocabulary in translating. For, sometimes, when a Hebrew word is not native to the Syriac language, the translators fall back on Theodotion, and are unable to correct an erroneous reading of Theodotion. Notice for instance, 10 7 H בחחבא, Th εν φοβῳ, S מן דחלתא. Notice also 12 13 H לגרלך, Th εις τον κληρον σου; but εις τον καιρον σου is found in the following MSS., 25, 35, 48, 89, 229, 230, and this rendering is reflected in the S ליבנך. Now both חבא and גרל are not native to the Syriac language. Furthermore, the translators depend upon the Syriac word עשק, "accusavit," when they render הסקו, in 3 22, by אכלו קרציהון, though they do know the meaning of הסק, in 6 24.

They render the Persian word אפדנו, in 11 45 by באתרא שפיא, — cf. פרדאדם in פרדאדם. And they certainly depend upon their native Syriac word גניא, "bed," when they render בגנדנא, in 7 15 by בני משכבי. That they guessed wrongly, at other times, in seen by some of the interpretations given in Section IX. And so the translators appear to have been Syrian Christians responsible alike for the errors of translation due to fitting a Syriac vocabulary to the Semitic original, and for the Christian theological coloring of the original.

---

[1] Wright, Syriac Literature, p. 3.

S colors two verses, avoiding especially the materials of the apparel of "a certain man," who speaks to Daniel:

10 5 לבוש בדים, S לביש לבושין דאיקר.

10 5 חגרים בכתם אופז, S חזיקין באיקר תשבוחתא.

10 6 וגויתו כתרשיש, S וחזוה משגני ולית לה דמו.

The appellation of God is sometimes denied to heathen gods:

1 2 אלהיו (bis), S פתכרה.

11 8 אלהיהן, S דחלתהין.

The expression "if our God be able," possibly, "lo! our God is able," is rendered, "because our God is able."

3 17 הן, S מתל ד.

The clause, "the heavens rule," is given a slight turn, by the rendering, "rule is from the heavens."

4 23 שלטן שמיא, S שולטנא מן שמיאהו 26.

XII. THE RELATION OF S TO THE SYRIAC FATHERS

Aphraates has numerous quotations from Daniel. Many of them are identical with the corresponding readings of the Peshitta. Some are accomodated to his context. The following readings of the Peshitta reappear in Aphraates:

5 25 מנא תקל ופרסין page 890.[1]

7 25 זבנא ועדנא ונמוסא p. 222.

9 24 ולמשיחא קדוש קודשין p. 880.

9 25 ולמאתא משיחא מלכא p. 880.

9 25 ונבנא לאורשלם שוקיה ופלטותה לשולם זבנא p. 881.

9 26 נתקטל pp. 806, 880, 882.

9 26 עדמא לחדתא דקרבא דפסיקתא דחבלא p. 881.

9 27 ועל כנפא דמנפותא p. 881.

9 27 עדמא לנמוריא דפסיקתא p. 940.

The abover eadings, with the exception of that found in 5 25

[1] The references are to Graffin's text.

are unique to the Syriac version. Hence the Peshitta is undoubtedly earlier than Aphraates.

In 8 2, Aphraates corrects the Peshitta to the Hebrew: S אבול אולי, Aphr.: נהרא אולי.

Ephraim Syrus has a commentary on Daniel in which he generally quotes verbatim from the Peshitta version. Some verses are not quoted, but are commented upon, in such a way as to reflect readings which are characteristic of the Syriac. The following readings from Ephraim Syrus prove the Peshitta to be earlier than his work:

1 2 פתכרה.
1 3 פרתויא.
1 8 נאכול.
2 9 חדאהי דאתכון.
3 1 דורא.
3 22 ונפקת נורא ולאכלי קרצא אוקדת.
3 29 הדם הדם נתפסק.
7 8 וקרנא זעורא.
8 2 וחזית בחלמי דקאם אנא על אבול אולי.
8 11 ומנה ארים אמינותא.
8 25 ובשליא דנכלה נחבל לסגיאא.
9 24 למשלם חובא.
9 24 ולמשלם חזוא ונביא.
9 25 ופלטותה.
9 25 ולמשיחא קדוש קודשין.
9 26 נתקטל משיחא.
10 5 לבושין דאיקר.
10 5 באיקר תשבוחתא.
11 1 למחילותני ולמעשנותני.
11 41 דאיסראיל.
12 1 מלאכא.

In 2 29, Ephraim Syrus corrects S to the reading of H and Th: S על לבך Ephr. Syr. על משכבך. Here S is probably the result of a scribal error.

In 5 25 Ephraim Syrus has the formula of Th: מנא תקל פרס, whereas S has the formula of H.

The text of these two church fathers, Aphraates and Ephraim Syrus, is accordingly, with rare exceptions, identical with that of the Peshitta.

XIII. THE RELATION OF S TO THE EVANGELION DA-MEPHARRESHE

A comparison between the Peshitta text of Daniel, and the quotations from Daniel in the Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe, yields the result that the Peshitta of Daniel has not influenced the Syriac readings of these quotations in the Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe.

There are only three of these quotations in which the Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe offers a different reading from the Greek New Testament:

Mat. 24 30 μετα δυναμεως και δοξης πολλης.
Ev. Da-M. עם חילא רבא ושובחא.
Luke 21 27 μετα δυναμεως και δοξης πολλης.
Ev. Da-M. בחילא סגיאא ובשובחא.

The change in these two cases in very slight and gives a Syriac reading corresponding to Mark 13 26 μετα δυναμεως πολλης και δοξης.

Mat. 24 15 το βδελυγμα της ερημωσεως.
Ev. Da-M. טנפותא.

Cf. Ephraim Syrus V 222 אתא טנפא דאמירא בדניאל. This reading of the Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe, in Mat. 24 15, is not dependent on the Peshitta of Daniel in 9 27, טנפותא חבלא, nor in 11 31 and 12 11, both reading, טנפותא לחבלא. Nor did the phraseology of the Peshitta of Daniel mould that of the Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe in Mark 13 14, טנפותא דחורבא; and in Luke 21 20, חורבה. No influence of the Syriac of Daniel upon the Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe can, therefore, be traced.

XIV. SPHERE OF ORIGIN AND DATE

As it has been shown that the Peshitta text of Daniel is not dependent upon Lucian and Origen, the presumption is that it it earlier than both Lucian and Origen, since these recensions became very prominent among the Syrians. This presumption is strengthened by the fact that we find it to be earlier than Ephraim Syrus and Aphraates. The latter flourished during the first half of the fourth century, and Ephrain Syrus a generation later. This makes the terminus ad quem for the date of the Peshitta text of Daniel about 300 A. D.; probably it was even as early as 250 A. D., the time when the influence of Origen's text was making itself felt. For this influence is not present, in the Peshitta text of Daniel.

The Peshitta version of Daniel must have been made after the rise of the Theodotionic translation, since it is influenced by this translation. Although the date of the rise of Theodotion is an unsolved problem,[1] we have another means of approximating the terminus a quo for the date of the Peshitta text of Daniel. That means is the translation of the Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe, about 200.[2] For it has been shown, in Section XI, that the theological coloring of the Peshitta of Daniel, fits far better in a Christian provenance than in a Jewish; and that its authors were Christians. Now if the translators of the Peshitta Old Testament were Christians, it is probable that a translation of the Gospels and of the rest of the New Testament existed first. Hence the date of the Peshitta text of Daniel, would fall after that of the Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe, that is, after about 200 A. D.

And so the translation of the Peshitta text of Daniel can best be placed between 200 and 250 A. D.

The place where the Syriac of Daniel was translated cannot be definitely fixed. Edessa, the literary capital of the Syrians, is the most probable place. There the Abgar tradition also places it.

---

[1] Smith and Wace, Dictionary of Christian Biography, *sub voce.*

[2] Burkitt, Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe, vol. II, p. 5.

XV. THE VALUE OF S FOR THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF DANIEL

Although S is, in a measure, dependent upon Th, it has some readings which appear to be better than the corresponding readings of Th:

6 6 בדת, S בדינא, Th εν νομιμοις.

7 6 על גביה, S על גבּיה, Th υπερανω αυτης.

8 12 צבא, S חילא, Th om.

8 25 על שכלו, S באוחדנה, Th ο ζυγος του κλοιου αυτου.

11 24 מבצרים, S כרכיהון, Th Αιγυπτον.

But where S agrees with Th, as against H, it has no value as an independent witness to the text; for, as has been proved in Section V, S is dependent upon Th. Hence ThS, as against H, reduces to Th, as against H. There are variant readings of some importance, in which S appears to have followed Th, for example:

2 16 ו על, ThS omit. Here ThS may represent the correct text, for in 2 25 H reads השכחת גבר.

3 14 הצדא, Th ει αληθως, S בקושטא, *i. e.* האזדא.

8 14 לי, Th αυτω, S לה, *i. e.* לו.

8 22 מלכיות, Th βασιλεις, S מלכין, *i. e.* מלכים.

9 27 שקוצים, Th βδελυγμα, S מנפוחא, *i. e.* שקוץ.

11 17 ועשה, Th ποιησει, S נעבד, *i. e.* יעשה.

11 45 אהלי, Th την σκηνην αυτου, S משכנה, *i. e.* אהלו.

In most of the above cases, the reading of ThS is supported by other translations.

Where S agrees with G, as against H, it is possibly of some value in supporting a reading. For, as may be seen in Section IV, there is little or no dependence of S upon G, since the differences between S and G, throughout the whole book, and especially in chapters 4 to 6, where G is very paraphrastic, far outweigh the correspondences. S together with G has some variant readings which may represent the original text:

9 22 יבן, G προσηλθε, S אתא, *i. e.* יבא.

11 10 בוא, G κατ' αυτης, S עלוהי, *i. e.* בו.

Except for interpretations and theological coloring, S is, in general, a very literal translation. Where S agrees with H, as against G Th Or Lu, it may be due to a better understanding of the original, on the part of S, as in 2 5,8 אזדא, S שריראהי, G Th Or Lu απεστη. But in most cases, where S and H agree, as against G Th Or Lu, this is due to the fact that these Greek translations give an interpretation of apparently the same original of which S gives a more literal rendering. Examples follow:

2 5 הדמין תתעבדון, S הדם הדם תתפסקון, G παραδειγματισθησεσθε, Th Lu εις απολιαν εσεσθε, Or εις απολειαν εσεσθε.

2 12 בנם, S אתחמת, G στυγνος γενομενος, Th Or Lu εν θυμω.

5 25 מנא מנא תקל ופרסין, S = H, G paraphrases, Th Or Lu Μανη θεκελ φαρες.

7 17 מלכין, S מלכין, G Th Or Lu βασιλειαι.

8 18 על עמדי, S על קימי, G επι του τοπου, Th επι ποδας, Or επι ποδας μου, Lu επι τους ποδας μου.

8 25 בשלוה, S בשליא, G Th Or Lu δολω.

9 26 משיח, S משיחא, G Th Or Lu χρισμα.

11 2 יעיר, S נעיר, G Th Or Lu επαναστησεται.

There are other instances in which S illumines or may correct H. For example, in 1 11, 16, S may indicate that המלצר should have a vowel after the ל, for S has מניצר. Cf. Lu Αμελλασαρ and V Malasar. In 2 5, Th S cast light upon the meaning of נולי נתשמין, Th having διαρπαγησονται, and S having נתבזזון; for this meaning is supported by the Assyrian nabalu. In 6 22, where H has מלל, S has מלל ואמר, which represents a better reading. Cf. Lu ελαλησε . . . . . και ειπεν, and V respondens ait. In 11 41, where H has ראשית, S has שרכא, which would be שארית, and may after all be correct. In 11 45, where H reads בין ימים, S has בין ימא, which may represent a better reading. For the construction בין . . . . . ל is fairly common in Hebrew. Cf. 2 S 19 36; 1 K 3 9; Ezech 41 18; 44 23; Jon 4 11; Mal 3 18.

XVI. CONCLUSIONS

A. Source:

1. The Peshitta text of Daniel was translated from the Semitic original, but was colored by the translation of Theodotion. (Cf. Sections III, V.)
2. It received little or no contamination from the Septuagint, and none from Origen and Lucian. (Cf. IV, VI, VII.)

B. Authorship and Place:

1. It hails from a Christian provenance. (Cf. XI.)
2. The place where it was translated is most probably Edessa. (Cf. XIV.)

C. Time:

1. Because it was colored by Theodotion, it is subsequent to that translation. (Cf. V, XIV.)
2. Since in a Christian provenance, a translation of the Gospels would exist before one of Daniel, the Syriac text of Daniel is later than 200 A. D., when the Old Syriac Gospels were translated. (Cf. XIII, XIV.)
3. Because the Peshitta text of Daniel shows no trace of the revisions of Origen and Lucian, it can hardly be much subsequent to their time, since these revisions became very prominent among the Syrians. (Cf. VI, VII, XIV.)
4. It is quoted by Aphraates and Ephraim Syrus; and, therefore, it must be earlier than these Syriac Fathers, that is, earlier than about 300 A. D. (Cf. XII, XIV.)
5. Although its date can only be approximated, it appears to have been translated between 200 and 300 A. D., probably before 250. (Cf. XIV.)

D. Value:

The Peshitta text of Daniel has a value for textual criticism, as testimony to the state of the Semitic original, shortly before Origen, Lucian and the Vulgate; but, because it is colored by Theodotion, the conclusion cannot be drawn that every reading of the Peshitta of Daniel represents the state of the Semitic original at

the time the Peshitta was translated. Where it agrees with Theodotion, it has no value as an independent witness to the text, because of its dependence upon that translation. (The same observation would apply to the Vulgate, when it agrees with Theodotion.) The Peshitta of Daniel also presents some Rabbinic interpretations of that time, agreeing in this respect with the Vulgate. It is in general, a very literal translation. There are a number of readings in which it agrees with the Semitic original, as against the Septuagint, Theodotion, Origen, and Lucian. This is occasionally due to a better rendering of the original, on the part of the Peshitta text. But in most cases where the Syriac and the Semitic original agree, as against the Septuagint, Theodotion, Origen, and Lucian, this is due to the fact that these Greek translations give an interpretation of apparently the same original of which the Peshitta, in these instances, gives a more literal rendering. There are also instances in which the Peshitta illumines, and may correct, the Semitic original, as we now have it. (Cf. XV.)